#### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-25 and 28-36 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 4, 15 and 27 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the *Information Disclosure Statement* filed March 17, 2005.

### Status of the Application

Claims 1-22 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 1-22 are hereby added. Claims 1-19 stand rejected.

# Rejection Under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-19 as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of US Patent Application 09/750,432 and claims 1-76 of US Patent Application 09/612,534.

As this is a provisional rejection, based only upon pending patent Applications, Applicant elects to defer addressing the merits of the provisional rejection until one of the cited pending Applications issues. Such deferral of addressing the merits of the rejection is clearly contemplated by MPEP § 804(I)(B), which states that a "provisional" double patenting rejection is designed simply to make Applicant aware of a potential problem. No response on the merits is required, as no patented claims are available to be analyzed. Should the Examiner believe that Applicants are required to address the merits of the rejection at this time, he is respectfully requested to identify authority imposing such a requirement.

Applicant reserves the right to address the merits of the provisional double patenting rejection or submit a terminal disclaimer to obviate the rejection.

Attorney Docket #A8644 / ST9-99-134US3

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 U.S. Appln. No.: 09/750,475

# Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, the Federal Circuit has indicated that 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be very broadly interpreted, as it allows the patenting of "any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter." In this instance, independent claim 8 is directed to "[a] computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for performing a method." A "computer readable medium" is clearly at least one of a "process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter." Thus, independent claim 8 (and dependent claims 9-11) are clearly directed to patentable subject matter.

Second, Applicant directs the Examiner to MPEP § 2106(IV)(b)(1), which specifically indicates that, "[w]hen functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized."

Third, with respect to the Examiner's allegation that:

... [c]laims 8-14 do not limit [sic] to tangible embodiments. In view of applicant's disclosure, there is no explicit and deliberate definitions which include examples intended to be cover [sic] by the claim terminology, i.e., computer readable medium, the medium therefore [sic], does not limited [sic] to tangible embodiments, instead being defined to includes [sic] tangible embodiment, applicant's omitted [sic] the definition[,] ...

Applicant cannot understand the Examiner's reasoning. An analysis of claims for compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be directed to the claims. However, it appears that the Examiner is

9

considering portions of the specification to support his rejection. This is simply incorrect.

Independent claim 8 is directed to "a computer readable medium," which is clearly patentable subject matter, as discussed above.

# Obviousness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Polizzi et al.* (US 2002/0023158; hereinafter "*Polizzi*") in view of *Kirby et al.* (US 5,925,117; hereinafter "*Kirby*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

# Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15

The Examiner takes the position that *Polizzi* discloses many of the features recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15, but fails to teach or suggest "a capability of reconnecting when [a] data source, e.g., [a] resource [becomes] available." Applicant agrees that *Polizzi* is deficient at least in this regard.

Nevertheless, the Examiner applies *Kirby*, taking the position that it discloses "a technique or concept of resource availability detection" similar to the claimed features.

Additionally, the Examiner alleges that one of skill would have been motivated to modify *Polizzi* with Kirby "to connect or reconnect source and target or data source and application" to "eliminate a tedious task of … manually checking and reconnecting communication."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Even if it were possible to modify *Polizzi* in view of *Kirby* as the Examiner has alleged, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Polizzi* nor *Kirby* (nor any combination thereof) teaches or suggests: (1) "detecting unavailability of the data source in response to an initial request for the data source by the remote application; dynamically detecting availability of the data source in response to a subsequent request for the data source;

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 U.S. Appln. No.: 09/750,475

and re-connecting the data source to the remote application in response to the subsequent request" as recited in independent claims 1 and 8; or (2) "one of the port module and the connection manager module are further configured to detect unavailability of the data source in response to an initial request for the data source by the remote application, to dynamically detect availability of the data source in response to a subsequent request for the data source, and to reconnect the data source to the remote application in response to the subsequent request" as recited in independent claim 15.

Specifically, the Examiner concedes that *Polizzi* is deficient with respect to these features. Further, with respect to *Kirby*, Applicant respectfully submits that *Kirby* does not detect "unavailability of the data source in response to an initial request for the data source by a remote application" (emphasis added). Rather, *Kirby* discloses that the computer system includes an event coordinator 202 for detecting when the computer system is separated from the dock. This event coordinator 202 then notifies the applications that the computer system is undocked (col. 5, lines 51-59; col. 6, line 51 - col. 7, line 14). Thus, unavailability of data sources in *Kirby* is broadcast to the applications, which is opposite of the claimed relationship.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-19 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

### New Claims

Claims 20-22 are hereby added. Claims 20-22 are respectively dependent upon independent claims 1, 8 and 15, and further specify connecting directly the interface module and

Attorney Docket #A8644 / ST9-99-134US3

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 U.S. Appln. No.: 09/750,475

the port module for "communicating independently from the connection manager in subsequent communications." Claims 20-22 are fully supported at least by FIG. 3 of the instant Application, and are respectfully submitted to be allowable both by virtue of their dependency, and by virtue of the features recited therein. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-22 are patentable over *Polizzi* at least for the reasons discussed in Applicant's October 14, 2005

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-22 are allowable.

personal interview with the Examiner in related Applications 09/750,432 and 09/612,534.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all

of the claims 1-22.

**Conclusion** 

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a

personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at

the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this

application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy P. Cremen

Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20037-3213

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 22, 2005

12